

Approved For Release 2001/03/06 : CIA-RDP84-00951R000300090009-3

~~SECRET~~ (When Filled In)

| AREA OR COUNTRY(S) | ORGANIZATION(S) | GENERAL FUNCTION(S) | SPECIFIC FUNCTION(S) | DOC DATE<br>CLASS |
|--------------------|-----------------|---------------------|----------------------|-------------------|
| HQ                 | OSO             | FI                  | Cable                | S                 |
|                    | OCD             | SUP                 | Dissemination ✓      | 51                |
|                    |                 |                     |                      | 22 Jan 5          |
|                    |                 |                     |                      |                   |
|                    |                 |                     |                      |                   |

## IDENTIFICATION OF DOCUMENT

Memo ADSO [REDACTED] for AD/C&D, Subj: Routing of Cables, 1 p.

25X1A9a

## ABSTRACT NOTATION REFERENCES

OSO dissents in establishment of a CIA Cable Desk under OCD jurisdiction; OCI has no priority claim on cables; such a group cannot determine OSO interest.

OSO asks that one copy of all cables be forwarded regularly for OSO retention.

## DOCUMENT LOCATION

HC/CSS-400

file 152

Approved For Release 2001/03/06 : CIA-RDP84-00951R000300090009-3

Assistant Director, C&D

JAN 22 1951

CCD

Assistant Director, SO

Routing of Cables

REFERENCE: Your memo dated 11 January 1951 same subject

1. OSO cannot concur in the recommendation that a CIA Cable Desk be established on the ground floor of the "M" Building, under CCD jurisdiction, because it is believed to be administratively unsound.
2. As is well known, OCI does not have priority interest in all cases. For instance, where OSO operational and CI responsibilities are involved, OCI not only has no priority claim on such cables but has no need to see them. Experience has also demonstrated that delays are most undesirable in referring such cables to OSO for operational action.
3. It is suggested that the establishment of a classified cable desk in a nonrestricted area would conflict with existing security practices.
4. In the light of prior OSO and ORE experience, the estimate that two or three people could handle this cable traffic is believed to be too optimistic.
5. Regardless of how many people would be assigned to this screening operation, it is very questionable whether such a group would be competent to determine OSO interests. The alternative would be to establish a panel consisting of representatives of the most interested offices. This would seem to be a rather expensive solution to a simple problem.
6. The proposal already made that one copy of all cables be forwarded regularly to OSO, for retention, would satisfy OSO's requirements at a minimum cost to CIA.

121 0011  
[REDACTED] 25X1A9a

[REDACTED] 25X1X8

[REDACTED] 25X1X8

*Retain or Destroy*